

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,441	11/20/2003	Yumin Liu	SYMYX/8DIVCO 2966	
1473	590 10/18/2004		EXAMINER	
FISH & NEAVE LLP 1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			NGUYEN, TAM M	
50TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105			1764	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/719,441	LIU, YUMIN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	-		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communicati ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ion.		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Au	<u>igust 2004</u> .				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>108-122</u> is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>108 and 117-122</u> is/a 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>109-116</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	re withdrawn from consideration				
Application Papers					
9)∐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	·				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa			(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		,			
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 109-116, in the reply filed on August 18, 2004 is acknowledged.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 109-116 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 72-83 of U.S. Patent No. 6,417,422.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims claim a process of preparing alkene from an alkane feedstock by using a Ni catalyst. The Patented claimed set does not specifically disclose that the reaction zone is maintained at a temperature ranging from about 200 to 350° C. However, the patented claimed set claims that the reaction temperature ranges from about 200 to 500° C. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of the claimed set by operating the process at a temperature of from 200 to

Art Unit: 1764

350° C because one skill in the art would operate the process at any temperature of from 200 to 500° C including the overlapped temperatures.

Claims 109-111 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 and 41 of U.S. Patent No. 6,355,845.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims claim a process of preparing alkene from an alkane feedstock by using a Ni catalyst. The Patented claimed set does not specifically disclose that the reaction zone produces alkene in a molar concentration of at least about 5% relative to total moles of hydrocarbon. However, the process of the Patented claimed is essentially the same as the present claimed process in terms of feedstock and catalyst. It would be expected that the dehydrogenation product would have a molar concentration of alkene as claimed.

Claims 109-111 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 24 and 56 of copending Application No.09/815,914. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims claim a process of preparing alkene from an alkane feedstock by using a Ni catalyst. The co-pending claimed set does not specifically disclose that the reaction zone produces alkene in a molar concentration of at least about 5% relative to total moles of hydrocarbon. However, the process of the Patented claimed is essentially the same as the present claimed process in terms of feedstock and catalyst. It would be expected that the dehydrogenation product would have a molar concentration of alkene as claimed.

Art Unit: 1764

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 109 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McCain (4,524,236).

McCain discloses an oxydehydrogenation process to convert alkanes (e.g., ethane) to alkenes (e.g., ethylene) by contacting the alkanes, in the presence of oxidizing agent, with a catalyst comprising nickel. The reaction has a selectivity of greater than 50%. Since the reaction has a conversion of greater than 60%, the product would have a concentration of alkenes greater than 5 % relative to total moles of hydrocarbon. (See abstract; col. Tables 1 and 2)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

Art Unit: 1764

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tam M. Nguyen Examiner Art Unit 1764

TN

9/27/04